

REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-20 and 23 are pending in this application.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “wherein at least one of the regionally applied security features include one or several layers with optical properties comprising a pigment selected from the group consisting of titanium dioxide, zinc sulfide, kaolin, ITO, ATO, FTO, aluminum oxide, chromium oxide, silicon oxide, phthalocyanine blue, i-indolidine yellow, dioxazine violet, a 1,1-chromium-cobalt complex, and a 1,2-chromium-cobalt complex”.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite “wherein the security feature includes one or several layers with optical properties comprising a pigment selected from the group consisting of titanium dioxide, zinc sulfide, kaolin, ITO, ATO, FTO, aluminum oxide, chromium oxide, silicon oxide, phthalocyanine blue, i-indolidine yellow, dioxazine violet, a 1,1-chromium-cobalt complex, and a 1,2-chromium-cobalt complex”.

Support for these amendments can be found on page 4, line 23 to page 5, line 6 of the specification.

Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to correspond with the amendments to claim 1.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-8 and 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaule (WO 99/569964; US 6,688,221) in view of Walter (U.S. 4,146,418) and Reinhart (EP 0210620), or alternatively, Walter in view of Kaule and Reinhart; rejects claims 9, 11, 20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaule in view of Walter and Reinhart, or alternatively, Walter in view of Kaule and Reinhart as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Zeiter et al. (U.S. 6,494,491); and rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaule in view of Walter and Reinhart, or alternatively, Walter in view of Kaule and Reinhart with evidence provided by Bitner et al. (U.S. 5,310,060).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Examiner asserts that Kaule teaches security features capable of being applied to a packaging film, wherein the security features comprise a layered structure, which is subsequently provided with additional functional layers, such as printed ink and adhesive layers (see Office Action, page 4, 2nd full paragraph).

Kaule teaches a cover layer applied to a carrier foil, wherein the cover layer can be a metal layer or a color layer containing any printing inks or special feature substances. The feature substances used in Kaule can be magnetic, luminescent, thermochromic, iridescent and/or other substances having a special physical and/or chemical effect (see col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 8).

However, the reference does not disclose or suggest, “wherein at least one of the regionally applied security features include one or several layers with optical properties comprising a pigment selected from the group consisting of titanium dioxide, zinc sulfide, kaolin, ITO, ATO, FTO, aluminum oxide, chromium oxide, silicon oxide, phthalocyanine blue, i-indolidine yellow, dioxazine violet, a 1,1-chromium-cobalt complex, and a 1,2-chromium-cobalt complex”, as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the reference does not disclose or suggest “wherein the security feature includes one or several layers with optical properties comprising a pigment selected from the group consisting of titanium dioxide, zinc sulfide, kaolin, ITO, ATO, FTO, aluminum oxide, chromium oxide, silicon oxide, phthalocyanine blue, i-indolidine yellow, dioxazine violet, a 1,1-chromium-cobalt complex, and a 1,2-chromium-cobalt complex”, as recited in claim 12.

Walter, Reinhart, Zeiter et al. and Bitner et al. also do not disclose or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 12 would not have been obvious over the references.

Claims 2-11, 13-20 and 23 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 12, and thus also would not have been obvious over the references.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

For these reasons, Applicants take the position that the presently claimed invention is clearly patentable over the applied references.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the rejections set forth by the Examiner have been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Friedrich KASTNER et al.

By /Andrew B. Freistein/
Digitally signed by /Andrew B. Freistein/
DN: cn=/Andrew B. Freistein/, o=WLP,
ou=WLP, email=afreistein@wondercraft.com, c=US
Date: 2010.12.21 14:01:16 -05'00'

Andrew B. Freistein
Registration No. 52,917
Attorney for Applicants

ABF/lkd
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 22, 2010